

REMARKS

Applicants have fully considered the Final Office Action mailed July 20, 2006 and request entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner (1) rejected claims 2, 15, 16, and 29-31, and (2) objected to claims 3-4, 6, 14, 17-18, and 21-28 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants cancel claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 14-18, 21, 27, 29, add new claims 34-41, and amend claims 22-26.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 15-16 under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Sato et al. Applicants maintain that these claims are patentable over Sato for, at least, the reasons discussed in a response filed on May 12, 2006. To expedite prosecution, however, Applicants cancel claims 2 and 15-16. Consequently, the rejection is moot. Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejected claims 29-31 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato. Applicants traverse this rejection.

Applicants note that claim 29 is cancelled herein, but claims 30 and 31 remain pending. Claims 30 and 31 directly or indirectly depend from claim 28, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable.¹ Since claim 28 is non-obvious, any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. Therefore, claims 30 and 31 are not obvious in view of Sato. Applicants request that the rejection of claims 30 and 31 be withdrawn.

¹ The Examiner indicated that claim 28 was objected to as being dependent a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants note that claim 28, as originally filed, is already in independent form.

New claims 34-41 are added herein. New claims 34-41 are independent claims and each correspond to one of claims 3, 4, 6, 14, 17, 18, 21, and 27, which the Examiner indicated would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 22-26 are amended herein to reflect that these claims are now dependent from new claim 40. Claim 31 is clarified herein to reflect that it depends from claim 30 and to recite that the perhaloalkyl is a perfluoroalkyl. Applicants request entry of the amendments, as the amendments and new claims are believed to place the application in better condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons described above, Applicants submit that the pending claims (claims 22-26, 28, 30-31, and 34-41) are now in condition for allowance. Applicants request that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby authorized to call Richard M. Klein, at telephone number 216-861-5582, Cleveland, OH.

Respectfully submitted,
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE LLP



Richard M. Klein (Reg. No. 33,000)
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582